

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/006,780		11/30/2001	Roman Sakowicz	CYTOP083	9903		
	20350	7590 08/19/2003					
		TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR			EXAMINER		
					BASKAR, PADMAVATHI		
	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834						
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				1645	\0		
				DATE MAILED: 08/19/2003	γ		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>		Application	No.	Applicant(s)					
•	Office Action Summary								
			v Baskar	*					
		l							
Period for									
THE MA - Extension after SI - If the pe - If NO po - Failure - Any repl	AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. riod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute,	ns of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed memunication.  (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely, statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (5) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. by will, by statutor, eause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). It is after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any  filed on  2b)  This action is non-final.  In for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is actice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  The application.  Are withdrawn from consideration.  The Examiner.  The Examiner.  The Examiner.  The examiner is: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.  The doing is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved by the Examiner.  The examiner is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved by the Examiner.  The examiner is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved by the Examiner.  The foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on								
<u> </u>	_		on-final						
<i>,</i> —	,			osecution as to the merits is					
_ 4)⊠ C	laim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application	ı <b>.</b>		•					
48	a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from cons	ideration.						
5)□ C	laim(s) is/are allowed.	•		·					
6)□ C	laim(s) is/are rejected.								
7) 🗌 C	laim(s) is/are objected to.		· .						
•	laim(s) <u>1-18</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requi	rement.						
Application		_							
′=	ne specification is objected to by the Examiner		installe by the Ever						
•		•	•						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
•	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep			vod by the Examiner.					
	12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
	der 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120								
		n priority unde	er 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d) or (f).					
·	All b) Some * c) None of:	, ,		, (-) ()-					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
<b>14)</b>	knowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	c priority und	er 35 U.S.C. § 119(e	e) (to a provisional application).					
		ledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  The degment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.							
Attachment(s	_		33						
2) Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	4) 5) 6)	Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/006,780

Art Unit: 1645

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following groups of invention is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Claims 1-7 and 16 drawn to nucleic acid, host cell classified in class 536, subclass 23.7.
    - Further restriction to one SEQ.ID.NO required (see paragraph # 4).
  - II. Claims 8-15 drawn to a recombinant protein classified in class 530, subclass 350.
    - Further restriction to one SEQ.ID.NO required (see paragraph # 4).
  - III. Claims 17 and 18 drawn to a method of screening compounds for anti-malarial activity using protein classified in class 435, subclass 7.2
    Further restriction to one SEQ.ID.NO required (see paragraph # 4).
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Group I is directed to DNA which consists of nucleic acids, Groups II is directed to recombinant protein, made of amino acids. These products are different from each other structurally, biochemically and functionally and are drawn to patentably distinct inventions which have materially different physical and chemical properties and structures as represented by their divergent sequences.

3. Invention II is related to invention III as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the protein of Group II can be used in immunoaffinity chromatography methods for purifying antibodies and need not be used in the invention III.

Application/Control Number: 10/006,780

Art Unit: 1645

## **Distinct Inventions**

4. For each group of inventions I-III above, restriction to one of the following SEQ.ID.NO is also required under 35 USC 121. Therefore, election is required of one group of inventions I – III and one of SEQ ID NO: 1 - SEQ ID NO: 10.

Inventions SEQ ID NO: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions SEQ ID NO: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 represent structurally different polynucleotides and structurally different SEQ ID NO: 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 polypeptides. Therefore, where structural identity is required, such as for hybridization or expression, the different sequences have different effects. Thus, each sequence is unique and patentably distinct since each sequence has a different structure with specific amino acid or nucleic acid and is identified by a specific SEQ.ID.NO. Restriction is deemed proper because these products appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions. These sequences are thus deemed to constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed SEQ.ID.NO from any group elected. For example: If applicant elect group I, then applicant is required to elect one nucleic acid sequence from SEQ ID NO: 1, 3, 5, 7 or 9.

5. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either

Application/Control Number: 10/006,780

Art Unit: 1645

instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, the literature and sequence searches required for each of the Groups are not required for another of the Groups, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 7. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Padmavathi v Baskar whose telephone number is (703) 308-8886. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30A.M-4: 00 P.M.) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith can be reached on (703) 308-3909. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 308-4242 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

P. Baskar Ph.D

8/13/03

LYNETTE R. F. SMITH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600